

'Some Writers are More Equal than Others': George Orwell, the State and Cold War Privilege

TONY SHAW

George Orwell's reputation for intellectual integrity and political independence came under the microscope in 1996 when declassified documents proved that shortly before his death in January 1950, the author had had secret dealings with the British Foreign Office's new anti-communist propaganda outfit, the Information Research Department (IRD). The records showed that not only had Orwell expressed his 'enthusiastic approval' of the IRD's techniques and aims, he had also furnished the secret organization with a list of 'crypto-communists' and 'fellow-travellers' in the arts, Fleet Street and Parliament whom it ought not to trust.¹ These revelations sparked a public row among politicians, journalists and academics about Orwell's revered honesty and his relationship to the Cold War. The veteran Labour Member of Parliament Tony Benn was shocked and disgusted to learn that Orwell had 'given in' to official blandishments, the Marxist historian Christopher Hill called Orwell 'two-faced', while the left-wing journalist Paul Foot labelled him a 'McCarthyite' informer. Others, including the former editor of *The Observer*, David Astor, and the political scientist (and Orwell biographer), Bernard Crick, staunchly defended Orwell's actions on the grounds that he was protecting democratic socialism against the very real threat posed by Stalinism.² Since 1996, a host of historians, political scientists and literary scholars have added to the debate about Orwell's IRD connections. While some like Frances Stonor Saunders have criticized Orwell for having confused the role of the intellectual with that of the policeman, the majority – like Peter Davison and Timothy Garton Ash – have put their weight behind Crick and Astor. Another of Orwell's supporters, the eminent Soviet historian, Robert Conquest, managed to muddy the waters of the debate by proudly admitting to having been on the IRD's payroll during the Cold War.³

The above war of words forms part of the struggle over Orwell's works and reputation *after* the Cold War. What this article focuses on

instead is the struggle to 'claim' Orwell's name (legend, even) *during* the Cold War. As Orwell scholar John Rodden reminds us, literary reputations are made, not born, and variously built, fashioned, manufactured, suppressed and distorted. George Orwell's image and legacy was contested feverishly in the decades following his death from tuberculosis at 46 years of age in 1950. More specifically, a myriad of politicians, intellectuals and commentators argued about what Orwell's stance on the Cold War would have been had he lived to see the conflict reach its maturity. While some did this out of intellectual curiosity, many others did so in order to strengthen their own position in the Cold War.⁴ This article seeks to cast a fresh perspective on this discourse by scrutinizing the indirect role that official Western propagandists played in it, and by examining the part these officials had in raising Orwell's profile to the dizzy heights that it achieved during the Cold War. The study focuses above all on why, how, and with what effects the British and American governments used Orwell's two best known novels, *Animal Farm* (1945) and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), as part of their anti-Soviet and anti-communist propaganda campaigns. My analysis is divided into three parts. The first section outlines why Orwell and his works were so valuable to Western propagandists. The second section examines the part that British and American propaganda officials played in disseminating *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* world-wide in print form. The final section looks at how the novels were transferred to cinema and television screens and at the political changes the books underwent in the process. The article concentrates throughout on the period from the mid-1940s to the mid-1950s. This was the formative stage of the Cold War and the period during which Orwell's legendary status was established. I hope this study adds to our understanding of how politics and literary culture interacted during the Cold War, and how popular Cold War images could be formed with clandestine assistance from government.

George Orwell – Public Asset Number One

Having spent a good deal of his writing career alerting people to the systematic misuse of language in modern politics,⁵ and having penned scripts for the Indian section of the British Broadcasting Corporation's (BBC's) Eastern Service during the Second World War,⁶ George Orwell would surely not have been surprised to see his work being posthumously exploited by governments during the Cold

War's battle for hearts and minds. Indeed, as we shall see, Orwell himself was quick to turn *Animal Farm* to the West's advantage in the late 1940s. But what was it about Orwell the man, and *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in particular, that official Western propagandists found so appealing, so much so that they were willing to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars promoting them? There would appear to be at least four main reasons for this.

The first and most obvious reason was that Orwell was a man of the Left. Through books like *The Road to Wigan Pier* (1936), his eyewitness account of the ravages of unemployment, his near death when fighting for the republicans in the Spanish Civil War, his vocal opposition to the British Empire, together with his patriotic calls for the socialist transformation of Britain during the Second World War (best exemplified in the bestselling *The Lion and the Unicorn*, 1941), Orwell was to many people a socialist paragon. Because he had never actually been in the Communist Party, Orwell lacked the 'inside knowledge' that former party members like his friend and fellow author, Arthur Koestler, could bring to their denunciations of Soviet communism during the Cold War. Yet, to official propagandists in Britain and the United States, Orwell's distance from the Communist Party rendered him less of a tainted 'fanatic', and one whose long-standing social democratic ideals might help win over the doubters on the liberal or non-communist Left to the West's cause. In sum, Orwell's radical, left-wing reputation would ensure wider currency, stronger credibility and greater efficacy in the officials' ideological battle against the Soviet Union.

The second reason revolved around Orwell's reputation for being an outsider. To this day (despite the body-blow of the 1996 revelations), Orwell's image remains that of a troublemaker, an activist, novelist and essayist who refused to succumb to political or social orthodoxy. A perfect example of this was *Animal Farm* itself, which many publishers passed over in 1944 and 1945 – with the help of a warning from the Ministry of Information – partly due to its allegorical depiction of 'Uncle Joe' Stalin's brutality.⁷ Orwell's independence of mind formed the basis of his reputation for political and artistic integrity; this might help to explain why his warnings about the dangers of writers being turned into captive animals in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and elsewhere struck such a chord with many of his readers.⁸ Orwell was a supporter of Attlee's ruling Labour Party in the late 1940s but this never stopped him criticizing government policies he found objectionable. In one of his last essays he spelt out

his desire for 'a Socialist United States of Europe' independent of Russia and America, which many took as a broadside against Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin's apparent pro-Americanism.⁹ Such views appealed to those inside and outside the Labour Party in the late 1940s who wanted British social democracy to act as a 'Third Force' in international relations, between American capitalism and Soviet communism. While these criticisms made for uncomfortable reading among IRD officials, the advantage was that they confirmed Orwell's autonomy.¹⁰

The third reason relates to *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* themselves. For a start, both books were short, direct and written in Orwell's characteristically clear style, making them accessible to almost everyone, including, in *Animal Farm*'s case, children. This made them easily translatable and suitable for radio and cinema adaptation. At the same time, the novels were multi-layered, and psychologically and politically complex, and thus could be a challenge to the literary-minded. This is why most critics adored the books, and why both novels suffered ideological misreadings.¹¹ Orwell in fact aimed to project two principal themes in *Animal Farm*: first, to 'expose the Soviet myth', and, by extension, to condemn tyranny universally; and secondly, and more positively, to show that the Stalinists had betrayed the Bolsheviks' original intentions and thereby to express his faith in the ultimate achievability of socialism.¹² In essence, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was a natural extension of these themes and was intended as a warning against the threat of totalitarianism, whether from the Left or the Right.¹³ However, given that *Animal Farm* was so incisive a fable on the history of Soviet communism, and that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* had not only been written during the early years of the Cold War (it was published in June 1949, just after the collapse of the Berlin Blockade) but also that the 'comrades' and show trials depicted in the book obviously drew so heavily on Stalin's Russia, it was relatively simple for the British and American governments to deploy the two novels as straightforward anti-Soviet propaganda. Moreover, the fact that the books did not mention communism directly, and that they were novels rather than essays or pamphlets, made them appear less like propaganda (as most people understood the word), thus rendering them potentially more persuasive.

Finally, Orwell's death in 1950 cleared the way for officials and others to appropriate his name and work without fear of contradiction from the man himself. Orwell was extremely protective

of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, both before and after their publication. He vehemently opposed the latter being 'mucked about with' by publishers, and consistently corrected misinterpretations of key aspects of the novels. He was particularly distressed by the use to which right-wing Cold Warriors put his writings in his later years.¹⁴ After January 1950 this policing role was primarily left to his widow, Sonia Blair, but her insistence on the right to vet adaptations of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* frequently fell on deaf ears. Orwell's 'tragic' early death, robbing the literary world of someone who had been cut off in his prime, also undoubtedly helped foster his legendary status, and consequently boosted the sales and authority of his works. Soon labelled by some intellectuals and politicians a 'prophet' or 'saint',¹⁵ Orwell for Western propagandists became a malleable, prized asset whose powerful rhetoric and vision would be 'clarified' and then spread as deeply and as widely as possible.

War of the Words: Pressing Orwell into Western Service

Orwell became famous in Britain when *Animal Farm* was published by Secker and Warburg in August 1945. In what John Rodden has described as 'probably the single most significant event for expanding Orwell's reputation in his lifetime', the fable was then selected as a September 1946 Book-of-the-Month Club choice in the United States. During 1946-49 the book sold 460,000 copies through the Club and soon became an American bestseller. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was published in Britain and the United States simultaneously in June 1949, and, thanks partly to the boost provided by another choice of the Book-of-the-Month Club, sold over 400,000 copies in its first year alone. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* confirmed Orwell's place in the modern literary pantheon. If *Animal Farm* had occasioned comparisons of him as political author with Voltaire and Jonathan Swift, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* prompted leading European and American intellectuals to rate Orwell alongside Fyodor Dostoevsky, H. G. Wells and Aldous Huxley in the anti-utopian tradition.¹⁶ Both novels were immediately seen as defining texts on either the emerging or freezing East-West divide, from differing and competing angles.¹⁷

In the late 1940s and early 1950s, the British and American governments conducted an intensive campaign to widen the political impact of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, first mainly in Central and Eastern Europe, later in the developing world. They

were sometimes assisted by Orwell himself. In January 1947 the British Central Office of Information wrote to Fredric Warburg, Orwell's publisher and friend, asking for his comments on a proposal for the publication of *Animal Farm* 'in a cheap English edition in Hungary', but nothing came of this.¹⁸ However, in March a Ukrainian edition appeared, complete with a preface written by Orwell spelling out what the book meant to say.¹⁹ In Germany, where the Ukrainian translation had been published, the novel was eagerly sought by anti-communist publishers, probably with the support of *Amerikadienst*, the translation bureau and news service of the US High Commission. In mid-1947 Orwell lent his support to these activities. His agent, Leonard Moore, corresponded with Russian anti-Stalinists in the Soviet zone about how copies of *Animal Farm* could be smuggled into the East. Orwell even expressed his willingness to subsidise its distribution, telling Moore that it was the right time for such a project since, 'the US is altering its policy, and doing more anti-Russian propaganda'. Orwell was also a sponsor of the Books in Germany programme organised by the British Foreign Office.²⁰

The Foreign Office's maximization of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was handled primarily by the Information Research Department. Established in early 1948, the IRD was the first major initiative in Western propaganda, antedating by several months similar ventures in 'psychological warfare' by the US government.²¹ Books were central to the department's efforts to produce and disseminate unattributable (or 'grey') anti-communist propaganda in Britain and overseas. In early 1949 – around the time that Orwell gave his list of 'crypto-communists' to the IRD's Celia Kirwan, Arthur Koestler's sister-in-law – IRD stepped up its publishing activities significantly. It approached several independent publishers, including Oxford University Press and Penguin, with proposals for anti-communist books, suggesting they be based on IRD briefing papers which had already been distributed to selected journalists. Allen Lane at Penguin was particularly responsive, believing there was 'a need for a book for the English public dealing with communism in an objective and serious way'. Related or not, Penguin later produced many editions of one such IRD paper, *The Theory and Practice of Communism*, written by Foreign Office Sovietologist Robert Carew Hunt. In 1951 and 1954 Penguin also published their first editions of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* respectively, both of which were reissued almost annually thereafter.²² IRD also circulated books and journals to posts abroad. For example, *Tribune*,

the Labour weekly for which Orwell had acted as literary editor in the early 1940s, was widely distributed on the grounds that 'it combines the resolute exposure of communism and its methods with the consistent championship of those objectives which left-wing sympathizers normally support'.²³ At the same time, IRD tried to find a publishing house with known left-wing affiliations to 'front' a series of books that would 'appeal to organized labour' and 'project "social democracy" as a successful rival to communism'. Orwell himself suggested Victor Gollancz to Celia Kirwan, but neither a deal with this company nor with Odhams, publishers of the Labour Party's newspaper, *The Daily Herald*, came to fruition.²⁴ Eventually, the IRD set up its own, ostensibly independent, publishing company, Ampersand, in 1950.²⁵

During the late 1940s and early 1950s the IRD successfully commissioned a number of prominent authors to write articles or pamphlets, including the London School of Economics's Harold Laski (who compared British and Soviet trade unionism), Labour MP Richard Crossman (who re-assessed the Nazi-Soviet Pact of 1939), and the former leader of the German Communist Party, Ruth Fischer, who looked at how the Soviets controlled communist parties outside their borders.²⁶ It also negotiated the foreign rights to books which offered dramatic exposés of communism, such as Douglas Hyde's *I Believed* (1951), or others which testified to the failure of the Marxist utopia, such as the highly influential collection of essays by former intellectual supporters of the Communist Party, *The God That Failed*, edited by Richard Crossman and published in 1950.²⁷ By 1955 the department could modestly boast that it was selecting and distributing approximately 24 anti-communist commercially published books per year.²⁸

Amidst this wordy crusade Orwell's work consistently took pride of place. In April 1949 plans were set in train for the distribution of suitable translations of *Animal Farm* in large parts of the Middle East, where British interests were paramount. Ernest Main of the British Embassy in Cairo, which was concerned about the susceptibility of Saudi Arabian oil workers to communist propaganda, told the head of IRD, Ralph Murray, of his colleagues' enthusiasm for an Arabic-language edition to be distributed in Cairo: 'The idea is particularly good for Arabic in view of the fact that both pigs and dogs are unclean animals to Moslems.' The IRD agreed to fund the project and arranged copyright clearance: 'the more the merrier', commented the department's Adam Watson.²⁹ Murray was naturally

extremely keen to make *Animal Farm* available in the Soviet Union. In June 1949 Orwell received a request for advice on investors needed to raise 2000 Deutschmarks for the production of a Russian-language version of *Animal Farm*: 'we ask you please not to think that this letter has been sent to you with any base mercenary motives, but exclusively in the interests of the cause of combatting Bolshevism, which cause your book serves so brilliantly'. The request came from V. Puachev of *Possev*, a weekly Russian-language social and political review with offices in London and Frankfurt, run by a group of Russian refugees which distributed anti-Soviet propaganda amongst the Red Army occupation forces in Germany and Austria. Orwell had already given the group permission to publish, free of charge, a Russian translation in serialized form, but it lacked the resources to publish and distribute a large print-run of the book. Orwell sent Puachev's letter to the IRD, who then passed it on to the Foreign Office, whose translator vouched strongly for the émigré group's credentials: 'we do of course know the Possev people do a good job'. In November 1949 Celia Kirwan informed the Voice of America director, Charles Thayer, of the imminent publication of a Russian translation of *Animal Farm*, 'undertaken by an impoverished but respectable group of Russian refugees in West Germany'. The book, *Skotskii Khutor*, duly appeared in 1950.¹⁰

As the Kirwan-Thayer correspondence suggests, the frostier East-West relations grew the more the IRD promoted Orwell's works in tandem with its sister agencies in the United States. This made sense given the latter's greater financial resources. Starting with a Korean edition of *Animal Farm* in 1948, the US State Department sponsored the translation and distribution of Orwell's books in more than thirty languages. From 1953 onwards it joined hands with the United States Information Agency (USIA), whose distribution network was vast. By the late 1950s the USIA operated libraries in 162 cities in all major countries in the world, with the exception of those with Communist Party-dominated regimes which steadfastly refused offers of facilities.³¹ In November 1950 the Foreign Office and the United States Information and Educational Exchange (USIE) arranged to produce jointly an illustrated Arabic version of *Animal Farm*. Aimed at the lower end of the reading market in the Middle East, the book was set at a price to compete with the 'cheapest thrillers' (£8 Egyptian), and was published under the cover of a Cairo company, Al Maaref Publishing House.³² At roughly the same point, the IRD purchased the right to circulate a strip cartoon of *Animal*

Farm via local newspapers in large parts of Latin America, the Far East, Europe, the Middle East, India, Ceylon and Pakistan. This 'brilliant satire on the Communist regime in the USSR', noted Ralph Murray, was 'a most effective propaganda weapon, because of its skilful combination of simplicity, subtlety and humour'. Officials kept a loving eye on the production of the cartoon strip, discussing characterization of the animals with the animators and continually stressing the anti-communist elements of the story. Distribution proved very successful, though the Belgrade embassy refused it on political grounds and Tel Aviv because pigs were deemed unsuitable.³³

By April 1951 the IRD's thoughts had turned to making a film strip of this cartoon for schools overseas, complete with an accompanying narration.³⁴ In the same month, as part of a State Department memorandum titled 'Participation of Books in Department's Fight Against Communism', US Secretary of State Dean Acheson authorised payment for the translation rights to *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. The memo stated that *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* 'have been of great value to the Department in its psychological offensive against Communism', justifying official overt and covert help with translations.³⁵ In June 1951, Acheson ordered the US embassy in London 'to assist foreign publishers' in bringing out further translations of *Animal Farm*: 'Offer \$100 PORT[uguese] book and serial rights; \$50 VIET[name]ese book rights. Publication RIO and Saigon. Use contingency funds, Reply soonest.'³⁶ By the end of 1951, both the State Department and IRD were reporting the imminent availability of Chinese copies of *Animal Farm*, including a special pictorial version.³⁷

Ten years after the end of the Second World War the sales of, comments on, and spin-offs from *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* had made George Orwell one of the best-known authors in the English language. Words or phrases culled from the two novels – 'four legs good, two legs bad', 'unperson', 'doublespeak' – had begun to be assimilated into the Western political lexicon and imagination. To a great extent the Orwell 'legend' was confined to the Anglophone world. But commercial interests had made his works available – if only in libraries – across many regions of the globe, assisted partly by British and American official propagandists shouldering the cost of rights, translations, distribution and, in some cases, adaptation and production. By 1955 the IRD was able to report that it had bought the rights to *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in Burmese, Chinese, Danish, Dutch, French, German, Finnish, Hebrew, Italian, Japanese,

Indonesian, Latvian, Norwegian, Polish, Portuguese, Spanish and Swedish.³⁸ Reflecting its determination to render Orwell more entertaining and accessible in the colonies, the department had also bought the right to circulate the cartoon strip of *Animal Farm* in Cyprus, Tanganyika, Kenya, Uganda, Northern and Southern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Sierra Leone, Gold Coast, Nigeria, Trinidad, Jamaica, Fiji, British Guiana and British Honduras.³⁹ No other books had been singled out for such treatment either by London or Washington.

There is no way of knowing how many people in these and other countries actually read *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, still less whether they interpreted the books in the way the British and American officials hoped they would, and then thought and acted accordingly. That said, it just might be more than a coincidence that it was in Western Germany, where in the early years of the Cold War Western policy-makers most feared a communist take-over, and where Orwell's works seem to have been exploited as anti-Soviet propaganda weapons more than anywhere else, that Orwell's standing far exceeded that in any other non-Anglophone country. One important factor in bringing this about was the championing of Orwell by the highly influential monthly *Der Monat*. Its editor was the American Melvin Lasky, a leading member of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)-funded Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF), an intellectual and artistic movement set up in Paris in 1950 that led a liberal offensive predominantly against communists and fellow-travellers during the Cold War.⁴⁰ As for Eastern Europe, in which at least some ambitious Western propagandists hoped *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* might have a destabilizing effect, Orwell was officially labelled, as *Pravda*'s 1950 review of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* put it, 'an enemy of the people'.⁴¹ Accordingly, none of his books were officially published in the Soviet Union or in any other East European nation aligned with Moscow throughout the Cold War. Librarians followed instructions to keep his books off their shelves, and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* received an official import ban in the Soviet Union until 1988.⁴² Despite these restrictions translated, samizdat versions of Orwell's works were passed around behind the 'Iron Curtain', especially among dissident Soviet and Eastern European intellectuals. In his classic of totalitarian literature, *The Captive Mind*, published after his flight to France in 1953, Lithuania's Czeslaw Milosz observed that intellectuals were 'amazed' that a writer who had never lived in Russia should have so keen a

perception into its life. Some Western intellectuals have consistently argued that *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, secretly circulated among writers of the Petofi Club in Budapest, was a catalyst of the 1956 Hungarian uprising. *Animal Farm* came into many people's hands courtesy of balloon operations run by the Free Europe Press, the publication arm of the National Committee for Free Europe. Set up in 1949, this body was a central component of the US 'state-private' network during the Cold War of the 1950s.⁴³ Finally, lest we overlook the effects that *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* had in Britain and the United States, it should be noted that by the late 1950s the novels were prescribed reading on school curricula in both countries, and in many of Britain's remaining colonies. How and why this occurred is a complex issue, but the fact that many teachers taught *Animal Farm* as a horrifying 'animallegory' of Soviet despotism and played up the Soviet parallels in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is surely of some significance, both for the Cold War of the late 1950s and beyond.⁴⁴

Seeing is Believing: Filming Orwell

Animal Farm and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* were adapted for the radio on several occasions in Orwell's lifetime, and many times afterwards. The BBC's cultural channel, the Third Programme, broadcast Orwell's own scripted version of *Animal Farm* in 1947 (repeating it in 1952), and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in 1950. In April 1947 Orwell gave permission for a Dutch version of *Animal Farm* to be broadcast, and the Voice of America broadcast *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in Eastern Europe in 1947 and 1949 respectively.⁴⁵ However, these adaptations, which seem to have been faithful to the books, were intended for and largely restricted to the literary-minded. What really lifted Orwell's profile during and beyond the first decade of the Cold War were the four adaptations of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* that appeared on television and at the cinema between 1953 and 1956. This cluster of American and British film and television treatments was, according to John Rodden, the biggest single factor in establishing Orwell as both 'The Prophet', a man whose work had grave political implications for the future, and a 'public' writer, one whose name and work were known by far more people than merely those who had read his books.⁴⁶ Each of these film and television productions had strong Cold War connotations. Two of them were intimately connected with official Cold War propagandists. 'Screening' Orwell therefore took on more than one

meaning, as we shall see via an analysis of each of the treatments in turn.

In September 1953, National Broadcasting Company's (NBC's) Studio One broadcast the first screen adaptation of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. NBC was the largest and most powerful of the four main television networks in the United States, and lent vigorous support both to Senator Joseph McCarthy's subversion allegations and Washington's tough approach towards communism overseas in the 1950s. So close was the relationship between NBC executives and government that programmes such as *Battle Report – Washington*, a news series covering the Korean War, were produced in the White House.⁴⁷ 1984, as the one-hour television play was titled, starred Eddie Albert as Winston Smith, Norma Crane as Julia, and Lorne Greene as O'Brien. It was watched in 8.7 million homes, a 53 per cent share of the market, making it the highest-rated Studio One programme that year. It received numerous plaudits from critics. 'I cannot recall seeing any other television drama so imaginatively and effectively presented', opined *The New Yorker*.⁴⁸ The play was a relatively straight adaptation of the novel but, perhaps inevitably given recent Cold War events – Stalin's death in March, the Soviets' crushing of the East Berlin uprising in June, and the Korean War armistice in July – and McCarthy's ubiquity, it was nevertheless interpreted by most commentators as an anti-communist warning. Some media organs jumped at the opportunity to drive this point home to the public, especially Henry Luce's magazines *Life* and *Time*. An arch-conservative and anti-socialist, Luce wielded his publications empire as a powerful anti-Soviet instrument in the Cold War. His contacts in officialdom were legion, and included the post-war vice-president of *Time*, C.D. Jackson, who had been appointed Special Assistant for psychological operations by Eisenhower in early 1953.⁴⁹

BBC Television's adaptation of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, broadcast on 12 December 1954, was the most ambitious and expensive television drama in Britain to date: one hour 51 minutes long, with 22 sets, 28 actors, and an established television star in Peter Cushing (who played Winston Smith).⁵⁰ This play was, in some respects, *too* faithful to the book. Viewers and critics in their droves found its evocation of Orwell's picture of Winston's daily existence in Oceania – grim, suffocating, fearful and pointless – shocking, and complained that the production was 'pornographic' and 'sadistic' in its depictions of adultery and violence. One viewer, housewife Beryl Mirfin, reportedly collapsed and died of a heart attack after the play's torture

scenes.⁵¹ When, much to the consternation of many, the play was shown again on 16 December, it attracted the largest audience to date in British television history.⁵² A month-long debate followed in Parliament and the mass media about Orwell, the novel, broadcasting censorship, and the links between television violence and criminal behaviour.⁵³ During this the *The New York Times* called the play, perhaps accurately, 'the subject of the sharpest controversy in the annals of British television'. Some proof of this was the series of death threats received by the film's producer, Rudolph Cartier, for whom the BBC hired bodyguards.⁵⁴

Since its inception, the IRD had forged close links with the BBC's overseas and domestic services, enabling the Foreign Office both to offer the corporation regular guidance about programming and to disseminate some of its most valuable anti-communist material.⁵⁵ BBC-IRD ties were strengthened further by a number of BBC senior executives having other prominent Cold War roles. For example, Harman Grisewood, the controller of the BBC's Third Programme during this period, was in the early 1950s also chairman of the British Society for Cultural Freedom, an IRD-backed offshoot of the Paris-based CCF.⁵⁶ Documents relating to BBC Television's 1984 reveal no evidence of BBC-IRD collaboration on this project. Neither the producer, Cartier, nor the adapter, Nigel Kneale, had explicit Cold War motives for being involved with it. Cartier intended the film to act as a warning against totalitarianism in all its forms (fascism, communism, and McCarthyism), whereas the apolitical Kneale wanted to recreate on screen what he saw as Orwell's 'brilliant ... setting down of a nightmare – our own age gone mad, gone bad ... [in which] Science is the slave of power, for power's sake'.⁵⁷ This did not stop newspapers on the Right adopting the play as a welcome anti-Soviet salvo. Lord Rothermere's *Daily Mail*, for instance, praised it for exposing 'the beastliness of Communism – something which we must fight with all our strength of mind and will', while Lord Beaverbrook's *Daily Express* began serializing a severely abridged version of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, all of which prompted one Labour MP to accuse the Conservatives of 'stealing' Orwell.⁵⁸ There is little doubt that responses like these and the sensationalism surrounding the play brought Orwell's work to the attention of thousands of people who up to this point had either never read *Nineteen Eighty-Four* or even heard of him. As *The Times* put it on 15 December: 'The term "Big Brother", which the day before yesterday meant nothing to 99 per cent of the population, has become a household phrase.' After

the telecast, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was catapulted into what the book industry has since called 'supersellerdom'.⁵⁹

However, letters to the BBC indicate that the play (and Orwell's book) had been interpreted in a variety of ways by ordinary viewers, many entirely divorced from contemporary politics; some, for instance, just expressed 'horror' at such 'pessimistic' material being aired on the Sabbath.⁶⁰ At the same time, it is noteworthy just how many commentators across the political spectrum referred to the BBC's 'coverage' rather than 'production' of Orwell's book, as if it were a real event that the cameras were at. This not only lent *Nineteen Eighty-Four* greater reverence but also encouraged people to see the book not as fiction but as a 'true' account of the nature of totalitarianism generally and of life behind the 'Iron Curtain' specifically. Significantly, it was soon after the BBC play that Isaac Deutscher famously called *Nineteen Eighty-Four* 'a sort of ideological superweapon in the cold war', with dominant Western readings of the book eliding Orwell's attack on capitalism.⁶¹

December 1954 also saw the release in New York and London of the first cinematic version of *Animal Farm*. This Anglo-American production warrants detailed analysis due to its political distortion of Orwell's book and its enduring use as an educational tool. In March 1951 Sonia Blair sold the animation film rights of *Animal Farm* to the American producer, Louis de Rochement. Acting as the conduit and providing the bulk of the finance for this deal (roughly £90,000), was a former Hollywood agent, Carleton Alsup, who worked for the Office of Policy Co-ordination.⁶² This was a body created in 1948 by the US National Security Council to conduct unattributable anti-Soviet psychological operations and which was housed within the CIA for administrative support.⁶³ For the project de Rochement hired the self-styled father of British animation, John Halas, who, together with his wife Joy Batchelor, ran Europe's largest animation company, in London. This had the advantage of being cheaper than recruiting Disney or Fleischer, Hollywood's established animators, and, by hiding its American (not to mention CIA) origins, gave the finished product greater international propaganda potential.⁶⁴

In constructing what was to be the first feature-length animation film to be made in Britain aimed at the general public and the first animated cartoon of a 'serious' work of art, Halas and Batchelor expected to work in their usual autonomous fashion. Yet advice on the script came continually from several interested parties. De Rochement, who in 1952 produced with the Federal Bureau of

Investigation's (FBI's) help the red-baiting melodrama *Walk East on Beacon*, insisted on Napoleon's authoritarian demeanour being accentuated and that changes be made to his key-note end speech.⁶⁵ Fredric Warburg, treasurer of the British Society for Cultural Freedom, and a man who had misinterpreted *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as marking his close friend's break with socialism, regularly visited the film studio.⁶⁶ And, in January 1952 a draft script was assessed by the US Psychological Strategy Board (PSB), an organization that between 1951 and 1953 acted as the nerve centre for US Cold War strategic psychological operations. One of the PSB's propaganda lines during this period was to accuse the Soviet regime of having perverted Marxism, and promoting a wider reception of *Animal Farm* corresponded nicely with this.⁶⁷ The PSB's film experts criticised the draft script for having a 'confusing' theme and 'no great clarity of message'. For the film to have its fullest impact - and contribute to the PSB's three-fold 'consolidate, impregnate and liberate' strategy - ease of understanding was considered essential. PSB officials argued, therefore, that it was far better to simplify, even at the cost of modifying Orwell's meaning, rather than confuse the audience with an overly precious adherence to the book's text.⁶⁸

The differences between the film version of *Animal Farm* and Orwell's book indicate strongly that this behind-the-scenes advice bore fruit. A film that appears at first sight to follow Orwell's narrative very closely in fact contains three sets of significant alterations. First, in the book there is no doubting Orwell's depiction of Napoleon (Stalin) as a despicable tyrant, nor that de Rochement's desire to magnify his authoritarian nature made commercial sense. Yet the book states that during the seminal Battle of the Windmill (the Second World War) 'all the animals, except Napoleon, flung themselves flat on their bellies and hid their faces'.⁶⁹ This represented Orwell's attempt to be fair to Stalin who remained in Moscow after the launching of 'Operation Barbarossa', directing affairs from the rear. In the film, however, Napoleon is singled out as the only animal (apart from Squealer) that does not fight, other than cowardly issuing a few orders from the safety of the farmhouse in response to direct attacks on him. Similarly, the book attributes Napoleon's trading with humans partly to the economic needs of the Soviet Union in the 1920s and 1930s, whereas in the film Napoleon's motives are reduced to pure greed (in the shape of jam for himself and the other pigs). Second, the film also virtually does away with the book's human characters and its references to the iniquities of capitalism and

limitations of liberty. Far less is made in the film of why the animals rebel in the first place; the 'tyranny of human beings' in Orwell's opening chapter is reduced on screen to Jones' drunken cruelty. The role that the humans play throughout the book in trying to stamp out the rebellion via black propaganda and the flogging of animals for singing the revolutionary anthem is cut. Two of Orwell's central characters, Pilkington and Frederick (the British and German governing classes), are virtually elided. Other than Jones himself, the humans are reduced in the film to an indeterminate pub rabble. In doing so, the film plays down the significance that the book attached to capitalist in-fighting, and Orwell's condemnation of Britain and Germany's strategy of isolating the USSR prior to the Second World War.

This line of interpretation is given a further twist in the final scene, which amounts to a wholesale inversion of Orwell's ending. The book concludes on a bleak note, with the now clothed pigs drinking, brawling and gambling with their human farmer neighbours, and agreeing they have a common interest in keeping the lower animals and lower classes subservient. The 'creatures outside', reads the last sentence, 'looked from pig to man, and from man to pig, and from pig to man again; but already it was impossible to say which was which'.⁷⁰ Here, Orwell was suggesting that there was no difference between old tyrannies and new, between capitalist exploiters and communist ones. Moreover, the raucous farmhouse party is meant to satirize the cynical power politics of the first wartime meeting between Churchill, Stalin and Roosevelt at Teheran in November 1943, and to predict their inevitable future conflict based on self-interest. This is why Pilkington and Napoleon draw the ace of spades together at the end of their card game. By participating in this future struggle, warned Orwell, the masses would once again be serving their oppressors' ends.⁷¹ The film changes this dénouement in two ways. First, the audience is not allowed to feel that the capitalist farmers and communist pigs are on the same debased level. The farmers are excluded from the scene altogether. Consequently, the watching creatures see only pigs enjoying the fruits of exploitation – a sight which impels them to stage a successful counter-revolution by storming the farmhouse, led by the inveterate cynic, Benjamin. The result is not only an uplifting ending that made commercial sense (as John Halas later argued), but also one which shows that an apparently invincible force can be beaten. It tied in nicely with the strand of US policy in the mid-1950s that encouraged

those living under the communist yoke in Eastern Europe to 'liberate' themselves.⁷²

Animal Farm was eagerly promoted by the American Committee for Cultural Freedom (ACCF), the US offshoot of the CCF. Media contacts spread word of 'one of the most important anti-communist documents of our time'; discount rates were offered to students and labour unions; and strenuous efforts (ultimately forlorn), were made to persuade Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer (MGM) to act as the film's distributors.⁷³ The IRD also made strenuous efforts to distribute it among 'the slightly educated' in the colonies and in other parts of the developing world, such as Indochina.⁷⁴ The film proved to be far from a box-office success, however. 'It was a serious cartoon and the distributors didn't know what to do with it,' said a spokesman for the Motion Picture Association of America in New York.⁷⁵ That said, if the critical response to the movie is anything to go by, the film's paymasters must have been pleased by its reception politically. While notable reviewers on both sides of the Atlantic actually accused the filmmakers of engaging in leftist subversion of Orwell's message and of having deliberately redirected the fable's satire away from the Bolshevik Revolution,⁷⁶ the majority recommended it as a faithful interpretation of Orwell's anti-communism. In labelling it 'a merciless commentary on the Slave State' and 'the child's guide to the Communist fallacy' respectively, Britain's *Catholic Herald* and *Daily Mail* indicated how keenly conservative newspapers exploited such 'respectable' opportunities for anti-Soviet propaganda, and how that propaganda might have been enhanced by animation's instant accessibility and apparent ideological innocence.⁷⁷ As things turned out, the film seems not to have penetrated Eastern Europe where, CIA distribution efforts notwithstanding, it was banned.⁷⁸ The film was easily translatable, however, and versions soon appeared in several languages, including Japanese, Swedish, German, Italian, French and Finnish. Beyond the 1950s, the movie was widely used as a pedagogical tool for British and American schoolchildren reading Orwell, thus helping to provide a new generation with a tendentious grounding in the origins of the Cold War.⁷⁹

Finally, like Halas and Batchelor's *Animal Farm*, the 1956 cinematic version of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was also an Anglo-American production. It, too, originated within the US government and it also, as might be expected, altered Orwell's message. There is good reason to believe that US propaganda officials had been looking to transfer *Nineteen Eighty-Four* to the big screen and thereby make

it more 'comprehensible' to a wider public for some years; after all, the book was required reading for CIA and PSB officials in the early 1950s, a measure of its perceived power as an anti-communist propaganda tract.⁸⁰ The film rights for *Nineteen Eighty-Four* were acquired from Orwell's estate in 1953 by the former president of RKO, Peter Rathvon. Rathvon enjoyed a close relationship with the US government in the 1950s, financing films for the Motion Picture Service, a semi-official organization linked to the USIA which assigned some of Hollywood's top director-producers to films that best projected American values at home and overseas.⁸¹ In 1955, production of 1984 began at Associated British's Elstree Studios outside London, with Michael Anderson as director. A subsidy of \$100,000 was provided secretly by the USIA on the understanding that it had control of the script.⁸² Distribution was to be handled by Columbia, a company which had produced a raft of anti-Soviet movies in the late 1940s and early 1950s, and whose president, Harry Cohn, was counted among C. D. Jackson's best 'friends' in Hollywood.⁸³ Help also came from the ACCF, whose executive director, playwright Sol Stein, gave Rathvon advice on the publicity for the film and its screenplay. In particular, Stein argued that for the film to do justice to the book and make audiences aware of the immediate dangers posed by communism, it ought to take the form of a docu-drama in which everything looked as contemporary as possible. For instance, rather than wearing sashes as in the book, Stein suggested the members of the Anti-Sex League have armbands. Most importantly, the book's ending had to be changed. As Stein put it, rather than leaving the audience in 'total despair', with Winston Smith capitulating to Big Brother, it was essential at least to hint 'that human nature can not be changed by totalitarianism ... so that the viewer, like the person behind the Iron Curtain, will be left with some small measure of hope'. This could be done, Stein proposed, by emphasizing the enduring love between Winston and his fellow rebel, Julia.⁸⁴

Virtually all of Stein's suggestions appear in the final print of 1984. Right from the very start of the film, when the narrator places events in 'the immediate future' and shocking pictures follow of atomic explosions, Orwell's world seems to be just around the corner. Hints of 'reality' are all around: Oceania's Thought Police tote machine guns rather than lasers, and Eurasian prisoners are paraded through an easily recognizable Trafalgar Square. Added to this, the film obfuscates Orwell's critique of international politics,

namely the expedient nature of great power alliances (like that in the Second World War) and his warning of a world divided into three super-states locked in never-ending combat (a Cold War), in which the masses are fed on a diet of propaganda and coercion. In the film, Oceania's war with Eurasia is attributed wholly to the designs of Big Brother, not the workings of the international system. Moreover, Eurasia remains an enemy throughout rather than, as happens towards the end of the book, suddenly being announced as an ally. Thus, Orwell's reference to the bankrupt nature of the Grand Alliance during the Second World War, which was intended to force people to question their leaders' motives, is excised. Furthermore, while, as in the book, Big Brother is never identified in the film, the unmistakable indications are that Oceania's ruling party is modelled on the Soviet regime, with Nazi flourishes. Thus, whereas some of Orwell's nomenclature such as 'comrades' stays in the film, other key points are taken out; Oceania's currency, for example, is changed from dollars, denoting American imperialism, to sterling. None of the explicit comparisons between 'Ingsoc' and the communists, which O'Brien makes in the book while brainwashing Winston, find their way onto the screen. Consequently, the important point that Russian communism is in fact inferior to 'Ingsoc' in terms of its ability to break its opponents' will and its ultimate quest for equality rather than power is omitted. Finally, the film concludes (at least in the British version), like Halas and Batchelor's *Animal Farm*, on an upbeat, bittersweet, counter-revolutionary note. Winston and Julia (Jan Sterling) overcome their brainwashing at the Ministry of Love and die, clutching each other, in a hail of Thought Police bullets as Winston shouts 'Down with Big Brother!'⁸⁵

Despite these changes, 1984 came nowhere near to being what the USIA's chairman had envisaged as 'the most devastating anti-Communist film of all time'.⁸⁶ The movie certainly attracted the interest of the critics, some of whom thought the ending was 'more true to life', and others who called it 'our own kind of doublethink'. Peter Rathvon felt compelled to respond to the latter charges, arguing, in newspeakian-terms, that the ending was 'more logical', and one which Orwell himself 'would have written' if he had not been dying during the novel's composition.⁸⁷ However, the movie emphatically 'bombed' at the box office.⁸⁸ Part of the explanation for this would seem to lie in the poor performances by the lead players, especially Edmund O'Brien as Winston and Michael Redgrave as O'Connor (O'Brien in the book).⁸⁹ But what undid the film probably

more than anything else was its attempt to straddle several genres – horror, romance, science fiction, thriller – with the result that many viewers were left confused. This can be attributed to commercial considerations and Columbia's need to maximize its profits by appealing to as wide an audience as possible.⁹⁰ The money spent by the US government on what ultimately looked a cheap and shabby production therefore cannot have been worth it. Indeed, the project might have served as a painful lesson in the difficulties of constructing effective propaganda when commercial and ideological interests are not in unison. The final word on the film was left to Sonia Blair. Having publicly castigated it at the time as a desecration of her husband's intentions, she decided to withdraw it (together with all of the other 1950s adaptations of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*) when the rights expired in the mid-1970s, 20 years after their original release date. The adaptations thenceforth became, as *The Times* put it, 'unfilms'.⁹¹

Conclusion and Epilogue

George Orwell attracted a remarkably heterogeneous following during the Cold War. Those who adopted and adapted his name and work spanned the whole political spectrum: Communist, Conservative, Anarchist, Trotskyite. This article has focused on the role played by state propagandists in the Orwell 'claiming game'. It has shown that officials were capable of using Orwell skilfully and clumsily, for the most part promoting his works, on other occasions distorting them. In the main, Washington and London concentrated on presenting Orwell as a new Man of the Right, one of the 'God That Failed' school of apologists. Accordingly, *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* were promoted as 'evidence' of the heinous crimes committed by the leaders of the Soviet Union and of the genuine threat posed to democracy (rarely capitalism) by communism. For its part, Moscow heavily censored Orwell, and attacked him as a crude Western lackey who hated communism and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* specifically as a 'monstrous' piece of capitalist 'misanthropy'. Like their Western counterparts, Soviet propagandists also acted more imaginatively at times, moulding Orwell for their own purposes. J. Edgar Hoover's Federal Bureau of Investigation was not a little piqued in 1959, for instance, when it learned that a Soviet-backed East Berlin Russian-language newspaper was satirising the Big Brother-like activities of the FBI in the United States. Hoover's

mechanization of surveillance, according to the article, made a reality of Orwell's vision of Americans' private lives being viewed by means of secretly placed television screens.⁹² Of course, Orwell was far from being the only author to have his work plundered by official Cold War propagandists. Arthur Koestler's *Darkness at Noon* (1941), Victor Kravchenko's *I Chose Freedom* (1947), and Alexander Solzhenitsyn's *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* (1962), are just three examples of literature which also acquired privileged status in the West with at least some help from Western governments.⁹³ However, none of these writers could rival Orwell in the book selling stakes. By the time of the collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989, *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* had sold almost 40 million copies in more than 60 languages, more than any other pair of books by a serious or popular post-war author. Such colossal figures help to explain why some commentators class Orwell as the most influential political writer of the twentieth century.⁹⁴

To attribute the presence of dog-eared copies of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in homes and libraries scattered throughout the world after 1945 largely to the promotional efforts of Washington and London would naturally be absurd. Orwell in many respects could not have timed the novels' appearance better given the deterioration of East-West relations in the late 1940s, and it was this, together with the arrival in the 1950s of a new 'celebrity age' courtesy of television, the improved levels of literacy particularly in the developing world, and the continued presence of the Cold War itself, that facilitated the rapid circulation of words like 'vaporize', 'Big Brother', and 'Orwellian', not official propaganda. Yet it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the work of the IRD, USIA, CIA and others did much to lift Orwell's profile, particularly in the late 1940s and 1950s (for which official records are available). Western officials found *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* far more pliable than their Soviet counterparts, as the cinematic adaptations of the works show. Categorical evidence that this reconfiguring of Orwell produced the results they were looking for is lacking. What the reactions to these films tend to confirm, however, is the contribution that *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* made to the culture of the Cold War by helping to imprint in Western consciousness, above anything else, the fundamental link between communism and totalitarianism. More generally, the study has highlighted the central, long-term role played by the book in the Cold War propaganda conflict, and the paramount importance of

linguistic issues – including the use and abuse of concepts such as freedom, tyranny, democracy and truth, as well as totalitarianism – within that conflict.

It remains to be seen whether Orwell's status dips as the Cold War recedes, and the sales and authority of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* diminish as the books are deemed less 'relevant' politically. For the time being at least, the 'claiming' of his works continues. In October 1999 the US cable network TNT, makers of the acclaimed *Cold War* documentary series aired in the mid-1990s, broadcast the first made-for-television version of *Animal Farm*. Directed by the head of Jim Henson's Creature Shop in London, John Stevenson, and filmed on location in Ireland, the production featured state-of-the-art animatronic technology and a cast of hundreds of live animals. The end of this film also markedly diverged from Orwell's text. The sheepdog, Jessie, whose puppies have earlier been taken to become Napoleon's guard dogs, resolves to lead an escape attempt. In a flash forward, we see the few animals which managed to escape return to find that the rule of the pigs has been overthrown and that the former Animal Farm has collapsed into decay and pollution. In another flash forward we then see a happy American family driving through the farm gate in an open car, a version of *Blueberry Hill* playing on the radio. This new family – the perfect owners – will run the farm and a new generation of Jessie's puppies will live there in happiness. The message to the viewer would seem to be obvious: thank heavens for the end of communism, and for the return of the market economy and human rights. It appears that Orwell is as useful to some *after* the Cold War as he was *during* it.⁹⁵

NOTES

1. Public Record Office, London (hereafter PRO) FO1110/189/PR1135/G, Minutes by Celia Kirwan, 30 March and 6 April 1949. That Orwell kept such a list was not news in 1996 to two of his biographers. See Michael Shelden, *Orwell: The Authorized Biography* (London: Minerva, 1991), p.468; Bernard Crick, *George Orwell* (London: Penguin, 1992), p.556. The list itself was published in 1998. See Peter Davison (ed.), *The Complete Works of George Orwell: vol.xx: Our Job is to Make Life Worth Living 1949–1950* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1998), pp.240–59.
2. Seamus Milne and Richard Norton-Taylor, 'Orwell Offered Blacklist', *The Guardian*, 11 July 1996, p.1; Ros Wynne-Jones, 'Orwell's Little List Leaves the Left Gasping for More', *The Independent on Sunday*, 14 July 1996, p.10; Tom Uley, 'Orwell is Revealed in Role of State Informer', *The Daily Telegraph*, 12 July 1996.
3. Frances Stonor Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the Cultural Cold War* (London: Granta, 1999), p.300; Davison (ed.), *Our Job is to Make Life Worth Living*

- 1949–1950, pp.324–5; Timothy Garton Ash in Peter Davison (ed.), *Orwell and Politics* (London: Penguin, 2001), xvii; Robert Conquest, 'In Celia's Office: Orwell and the Cold War', *Times Literary Supplement*, 21 Aug. 1998, pp.4–5. For the most recent defence of Orwell's actions – on the grounds that the IRD was not involved in domestic surveillance, that Orwell was not motivated by personal gain, that nobody suffered as a result, and that, anyway, some of his suspicions turned out to be right – see Christopher Hitchens, *Orwell's Victory* (London: Penguin, 2002). For a critical response to Hitchens see Andy Croft, 'Ministry of Truth', *The Guardian*, 25 May 2002, p.9 (Review section).
4. John Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation: The Making and Claiming of 'St. George' Orwell* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), pp.ix and 263ff.
5. See, for instance, George Orwell, 'Politics and the English Language', reprinted from George Orwell, *Shooting an Elephant and Other Essays* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1946), in Robert Jackall (ed.), *Propaganda* (London: Macmillan, 1995), pp.423–37.
6. W.J. West (ed.), *Orwell: The War Commentaries* (London: Duckworth/BBC, 1985).
7. Crick, *George Orwell*, pp.455–6.
8. See also George Orwell, 'The Prevention of Literature', in George Orwell, *The Orwell Reader: Fiction, Essays and Reportage by George Orwell* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1955), pp.367–79.
9. George Orwell, 'Toward European Unity', *Partisan Review*, July–Aug. 1947, reproduced in Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus (eds.), *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*, vol. iv: *In Front of Your Nose 1945–50* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1968), pp.370–6.
10. For more on the 'Third Force' issue and the IRD's relationship to it see Christopher Mayhew, *A War of Words: A Cold War Witness* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1998), pp.14–47; Hugh Wilford, 'The Information Research Department: Britain's Secret Cold War Weapon Revealed', *Review of International Studies* 24/3 (1998), pp.353–69.
11. For the reviewers' 'wars' that greeted the publication of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* see Crick, *George Orwell*, pp.488–92, 563–70, 603–4; Shelden, *Orwell*, pp.470–4; Donald McCormick, *Approaching 1984* (London: David and Charles, 1980), pp.12–13.
12. Crick, *George Orwell*, pp.450–52, 488; Jeffrey Meyers, *A Reader's Guide to George Orwell* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1975), p.131.
13. Gillian Fenwick (ed.), *George Orwell: A Bibliography* (New Castle, Delaware: St. Paul's Bibliographies, Winchester/Oak Knoll Press, 1998), pp.126–31.
14. *Ibid.*, p.129; Crick, *George Orwell*, p.569; Davison (ed.), *Our Job is to Make Life Worth Living 1949–1950*, pp.134–6.
15. See Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation*.
16. *Ibid.*, pp.44–5. Publishing information about the sales of Orwell's books between 1946 and 1970 can be found in Fredric Warburg, *All Authors are Equal* (London: Hutchinson, 1973), pp.35–59, 92–121.
17. Crick, *George Orwell*, pp.488–92, 563–70, 603–4; Shelden, *Orwell*, pp.470–74; McCormick, *Approaching 1984*, pp.12–13; See Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation* 4, *passim*.
18. Davison (ed.), *The Complete Works of George Orwell*: xix: *It is What I Think 1947–1948* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1998), p.23. A Hungarian edition of *Animal Farm* was eventually published in 1984. See Fenwick (ed.), *George Orwell*, p.118.
19. Davison (ed.), *It is What I Think 1947–1948*, pp.86–9.
20. *Ibid.*, pp.211, 224; Letters from Orwell to Leonard Moore, 10 April 1947 and 24 July 1947, 11 Aug. 1947: Berg Collection, New York Public Library. On the political and diplomatic context of this work in Germany by the US High Commission and the British Foreign Office see Nicholas Pronay and Keith Wilson (eds.), *The Political Re-education of Germany and her Allies after World War Two* (London: Croom Helm, 1985).

21. On the IRD's establishment and activities in the late 1940s and 1950s see L. Smith, 'Covert British Propaganda: The Information Research Department, 1947-77', *Millennium* 9/1 (1980), pp.67-83; R. Fletcher, 'British Propaganda since World War Two - A Case Study', *Media, Culture and Society* 4/2 (1982), pp.97-109; W. Wark, 'Coming in from the Cold: British Propaganda and the Red Army Defectors, 1945-52', *The International History Review* 9/1 (1987), pp.48-72; W.S. Lucas and C.J. Morris, 'A Very British Crusade: The Information Research Department and the Beginning of the Cold War', in R. Aldrich (ed.), *British Intelligence, Strategy and the Cold War* (London: Routledge, 1992), pp.85-110; Foreign and Commonwealth Office Library and Records Department, *IRD: Origins and Establishment of the Foreign Office Information Research Department 1946-48* (London: Foreign and Commonwealth Office Library and Records Department, 1995); S.L. Carruthers, 'A Red Under Every Bed? Anti-Communist Propaganda and Britain's Response to Colonial Insurgency', *Contemporary Record* 9/2 (1995), pp.294-318; Paul Lashmar and James Oliver, *Britain's Secret Propaganda War* (Stroud: Sutton, 1998); Tony Shaw, 'The British Popular Press and the Early Cold War', *History* 83/269 (1998), pp.66-85; Wilford, 'The Information Research Department'; Tony Shaw, 'The Information Research Department of the British Foreign Office and the Korean War, 1950-1953', *Journal of Contemporary History* 34/2 (1999), pp.263-82.
22. PRO FO1110/221/PR1373/G, Minute by Leslie Sheridan, 12 May 1949; FO1110/221/PR1589/G, Ralph Murray to Christopher Mayhew, 10 April 1949; Lashmar and Oliver, *Britain's Secret Propaganda War*, p.98; Fenwick (ed.), *George Orwell*, pp.103-4, 136-7.
23. PRO FO1110/221/PR442 IRD circular, 4 March 1949.
24. PRO FO1110/221/PR1589/G Ralph Murray to Christopher Mayhew, 10 April 1949; FO1110/189/PR1135/G Minute by Celia Kirwan, 30 March 1949; FO1110/221/PR505G Ralph Murray to Christopher Warner, 28 Jan. 1949.
25. For the details of Ampersand and other companies that published IRD material between the early 1950s and 1977, when the IRD was closed down, see Lashmar and Oliver, *Britain's Secret Propaganda War*, pp.100-103.
26. PRO FO1110/264/1634/G June 1949; Davison (ed.), *Our Job is to Make Life Worth Living 1949-1950*, p.319.
27. PRO FO1110/373/PR8/27/51, Minute by C. Stephenson, 28 March 1951. Hyde had left the Communist Party in 1948 when he was news editor of the *Daily Worker*. Published by Heinemann, *I Believed* was a bestselling, sensational account of his work for the 'cause' and his conversion to Catholicism. *The God That Failed* was published in Britain by Hamish Hamilton and by Harper and Bros in the United States in January 1950. Its contributors were Ignazio Silone, André Gide, Richard Wright, Arthur Koestler, Louis Fischer and Stephen Spender. On the book's origins and impact see Anthony Howard, *Crossman: The Pursuit of Power* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1990), pp.142-3, and Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper?*, pp.64-6.
28. PRO FO1110/716/PR10111/31/G, Report on IRD work, 20 May 1955.
29. PRO FO1110/221, Ernest Main to Ralph Murray, 4 April 1949.
30. PRO FO1110/221/PR3361, letter (translated), V. Puachev to Orwell, 24 June 1949; FO1110/221/PR3361, correspondence between FO and IRD, 18 July 1949; FO 1110/221/PR3361 Celia Kirwan to Charles Thayer, 4 Nov. 1949; Davison (ed.), *It is What I Think 1947-1948*, p.473; Davison (ed.), *Our Job is to Make Life Worth Living 1949-1950*, p.153; Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus (eds.), *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*, vol. iv: *In Front of Your Nose* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1968), p.567.
31. Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation*, p.202; Walter Hixson, *Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture and the Cold War, 1945-1961* (London: Macmillan, 1997), pp.123-4.
32. PRO FO1110/319/PR48/82/G, Roderick Parkes to Ralph Murray, 25 Oct. 1950; Minutes by Ralph Murray and Leslie Sheridan, 7 and 10 Nov. 1950.
33. PRO FO1110/365/PR127/9, Ralph Murray circular, 11 Dec. 1950. For details of the

- production process see FO1110/392/PR32/14/51/G and FO1110/392/PR32/89/G.
34. PRO FO1110/392/PR32/41/51 IRD circular, 25 April 1951.
35. Cited in Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation*, p.434.
36. US National Archives, Washington, DC, RG59 511.4121/6-2651, Acheson to US Embassy London, 26 June 1951.
37. Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation*, p.434; PRO FO1110/373/PR8/78, John Rayner to Ralph Murray, 16 March 1951.
38. PRO FO 1110/738/PR121/68/G, Minute by IRD's Editorial Adviser, 21 Feb. 1955.
39. PRO FO1110/740/PR124/3/G, H.A.H. Cortazzi to Douglas Williams, 28 Jan. 1955.
40. On Orwell's enormous reputation in West Germany, including the efforts by *Der Monat*, during the Cold War see Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation*, pp.288ff. For more on Lasky and the CCF's activities in general see Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper?* and Peter Coleman, *The Liberal Conspiracy: The Congress for Cultural Freedom and the Struggle for the Mind of Post-War Europe* (New York: The Free Press, 1989).
41. I. Arsimov, 'Enemies of Mankind', *Pravda*, 12 May 1950, p.3. Translated in *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, 1 July 1950, pp.14-15.
42. Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation*, p.202.
43. *Ibid.*, pp.210-11; Arch Puddington, *Broadcasting Freedom: The Cold War Triumph of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty* (Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 2000), pp.12-13, 67; Scott Lucas, *Freedom's War: The US Crusade Against the Soviet Union 1945-56* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), pp.100-104, 253-5. On the part played by Secker and Warburg in promoting *The Captive Mind* as 'the first full-length story of the position of the intellectual behind the Iron Curtain', see Gordon Johnston, 'Writing and Publishing the Cold War: John Berger and Secker and Warburg', *Twentieth Century British History* 12/4 (2001), pp.451. On the influence and availability of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in Eastern Europe in later Cold War decades see also Timothy Garton Ash in Davison (ed.), *Orwell and Politics*, pp.xi-xii; Dan Jacobsen, 'The Invention of "Orwell"', *The Times Literary Supplement*, 21 Aug. 1998, p.3.
44. Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation*, pp.82-9. As a schoolboy in Manchester, England in the 1970s, I can testify to this on both counts.
45. Peter Davison (ed.), *The Complete Works of George Orwell*: vol. xiii: *Animal Farm* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1998), pp.115-24; Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation*, p.202.
46. Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation*, p.273.
47. Nancy E. Bernard, *US Television News and Cold War Propaganda 1947-1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp.48, 115-31, 155-77. CBS, ABC and DuMont were the three other US television networks.
48. Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation*, p.274; Philip Hamburger, 'Nineteen Eighty-Four', *The New Yorker*, 3 Oct. 1953, p.84.
49. Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation*, p.274; Emma Lambert, 'Time, Inc. and the Cultural Cold War during the Eisenhower Administration', paper presented at the 69th Anglo-American Conference of Historians, Institute of Historical Research, London, 7 July 2000; Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper?*, pp.52, 146-7, 158, 266; Lucas, *Freedom's War*, pp.166-8.
50. Jason Jacobs, *The Intimate Screen: Early British Television Drama* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp.139, 151.
51. BBC Written Archives Centre, Reading (hereafter BBC WAC): AC T5/362/2 Television Drama *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1954), File 2; BBC WAC Press Cuttings P6555, Book 14a Television Programmes, 1953-4; BBC WAC Transcript of *Panorama*, 15 Dec. 1954; Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation*, p.275.
52. Paula Burton, *British Broadcasting: Radio and Television in the United Kingdom* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956), pp.275-6.
53. BBC WAC T5/362/2 Television Drama 1984 (1954), File 2; BBC WAC Press Cuttings P6555, Book 14a Television Programmes, 1953-4; BBC WAC Transcript of 'Panorama', 15 Dec. 1954; Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation*, pp.274-80.

54. 'BBC Repeats 1984 Despite Objections', *The New York Times*, 17 Dec. 1954, p.35; Jacobs, *The Intimate Screen*, p.155.
55. See Foreign and Commonwealth Office Library and Records Department, IRD, pp.17–18; Wilford, 'The Information Research Department', pp.364–6; Lashmar and Oliver, *Britain's Secret Propaganda War*, pp.57–65; Mayhew, *A War of Words*, *passim*.
56. Both the Honorary Secretary, Michael Goodwin, and General Secretary, John Clews, of the British Society for Cultural Freedom were IRD contract employees. Warburg, *All Authors are Equal*, pp.154–7; Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper?*, especially pp.109–11.
57. *Daily Express*, 14 Dec. 1954, in BBC WAC Press Cuttings P6555, Book 14a Television Programmes, 1953–4; Nigel Kneale, 'The Last Rebel in Airstrip One', *Radio Times*, 10 Dec. 1954, p.15. Kneale had created the immensely popular and critically acclaimed 1953 science-fiction BBC television serial, 'Quatermass'. This might help to account for the science-fiction feel of 'Nineteen Eighty-Four'.
58. '1984 and All That', *Daily Mail*, 14 Dec. 1954, p.1; '1984', *Daily Express*, 15 Dec. 1954; 'The Lesson of "1984"', *Daily Mail*, 18 Dec. 1954, p.1; Peter Black, 'Honest Orwell Did Not Write To Horrify, in Love with Freedom He wanted To Warn', *Daily Mail*, 14 Dec. 1954, p.4.
59. '1984', *The Times*, 15 Dec. 1954, p.5. Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation*, writes: 'It is probably unusual that one can point to a single moment from which a writer's popular reputation is "launched", but in Orwell's case the date is clear: Sunday, 12 Dec. 1954', (p.274). On the huge sales of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* after the BBC play, see *ibid.*, p.281.
60. These letters can be found in BBC WAC T5/362/2 Television Drama '1984' (1954), File 2.
61. *The Times*, 16 Dec. 1954; *New Statesman*, 18 Dec. 1954; BBC WAC Press Cuttings P6555, Book 14a Television Programmes, 1953–4; Isaac Deutscher, '1984 – Mysticism of Cruelty', reprinted in *Heretics and Renegades, and Other Essays* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1955), p.35. Susan L. Carruthers (Rutgers) has undertaken further analysis of the role of novels by Orwell and Arthur Koestler in the construction of Cold War perceptions of Soviet 'totalitarianism'. See, for example, '"More Dramatic than Fact": Cold War Fiction, Modernity and the Total State', paper delivered at the July 2001 conference of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations, Washington, DC, USA.
62. Contract for *Animal Farm* between RD-DR Corporation and Halas and Batchelor Cartoon Films Ltd., 19 Nov. 1951, Halas and Batchelor Collections, London; Letter from Borden Mace, President of RD-DR Corporation, during the making of *Animal Farm*, to author, 28 March 1998; *Daily Film Renter*, 28 Nov. 1951; Howard Hunt, *Undercover: Memoirs of an American Secret Agent* (London: W.H. Allen, 1975), p.70.
63. Evan Thomas, *The Very Best Men: Four Who Dared – The Early Years of the CIA* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995), pp.29–30, 32–3, 63; Harry Rositzke, *The CIA's Secret Operations* (New York: Reader's Digest Press, 1977), pp.149–54; John Ranelagh, *The Agency: The Rise and Decline of the CIA* (London: Sceptre, 1988), pp.198–202, 216–24.
64. Paul Wells, 'Dustbins, Democracy and Defence: Halas and Batchelor and the Animated Film in Britain 1940–1947', in Pat Kirkham and David Thoms (eds.), *War Culture: Social Change and the Changing Experience in World War Two* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1995), pp.61–72; Elaine Burrows, 'Live Action: A Brief History of British Animation', in Charles Barr (ed.), *All Our Yesterdays* (London: British Film Institute, 1986), pp.272–85; Letter from Borden Mace, President of RD-DR Corporation, during the making of *Animal Farm*, to author, 28 March 1998.
65. Notes on discussion of script changes, Sept. and Oct. 1951, and on changes made in dialogue and timing, September 1952, *Animal Farm* archive, Halas and Batchelor collection, Southampton Institute's International Animation Research Archive (SIARA); Letter from Borden Mace to author, 28 March 1998; Review of *Crime of the Century* (British title of *Walk East on Beacon*), *Monthly Film Bulletin*, Sept. 1952.
66. Letter from John Halas to Warburg, 12 Nov. 1952, *Animal Farm* archive, Halas and

- Batchelor collection, SHARA; Crick, *George Orwell*, p.560, p.567. Secker and Warburg published an illustrated edition of *Animal Farm* based on the film in 1954. For more on the linkages between Secker and Warburg and the CCF see Johnston, 'Writing and Publishing the Cold War', pp.432-60.
67. *Foreign Relations of the United States* (hereafter FRUS), vol.i, 1951 (Washington DC, 1979), pp.178-80, paper approved by the PSB, 28 September 1951 - 'Role of PSB under 4/4/51 Presidential Directive'; Scott Lucas, 'Campaigns of Truth: The Psychological Strategy Board and American Ideology, 1951-1953', *The International History Review* 18/2 (1996), pp.279-302; Hixson, *Parting the Curtain*, pp.17-19.
68. Richard Hirsch, PSB, to Tracy Barnes, 'Comment on "Animal Farm" Script', 23 Jan. 1952, PSB Index Files 062.2., Harry S. Truman Library, Independence, Missouri. This emphasis on the simplicity of the propaganda message also surfaced in January 1952 during the PSB's consideration of an enhanced role for literature as an anti-communist weapon. Cleverly distributed, clearly written and effectively subsidized, 'a literature of counter-ideology' would spell out 'the lie inherent in Soviet propaganda'. Godel to Barnes, 14 Jan. 1952, *United States Declassified Document Reference System* (hereafter DDCS) 1991, 1113.
69. George Orwell, *Animal Farm* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1980), p.88.
70. *Ibid.*, p.120.
71. Patrick Murray, *Companion to Animal Farm* (Dublin: The Educational Press, 1985), p.39; Crick, *George Orwell*, p.451.
72. Script change discussions, March and Nov. 1952, *Animal Farm* archive, Halas and Batchelor collection, SHARA; Author's correspondence with Vivian Halas, Feb. 1998; Lucas, *Freedom's War*.
73. Sol Stein, ACCF Executive Director, letter to Paris Theatre manager, 5 Jan. 1955; Stein memorandum concerning discount coupons for *Animal Farm*, 11 Jan. 1955; Murray Baron circular to trade unions, 17 Jan. 1955; Borden Mace letter to Stein concerning MGM distribution, 14 Jan. 1955; Box 8, folder 2, ACCF archives, Tamiment Library, New York University.
74. PRO FO 1110/740/PR124/3/G, H.A.H. Cortazzi to Douglas Williams, 28 Jan. 1955; FO 1110/740/PR124/6/G, Information Section Saigon Embassy to Information Policy Department, 9 March 1955.
75. Cited in Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation*, p.445.
76. Spencer Brown, 'Strange Things at Animal Farm', *Commentary* (Feb. 1955), p.157; David Sylvester, 'Orwell on the Screen', *Encounter* 4/3 (1955), pp.35-7.
77. *Catholic Herald*, cited in *Films and Filming* 1/6 (1955); *Daily Mail*, 12 Jan. 1955.
78. Hunt, *Undercover*, p.70; Hixson, *Parting the Curtain*, pp.87-119.
79. International newspaper cuttings scrapbook, *Animal Farm* archive, Halas and Batchelor collection, SHARA; Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation*, pp.382-98. For a fuller analysis of the 1950s' cinematic versions of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* see Tony Shaw, *British Cinema and the Cold War: The State, Propaganda and Consensus* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2001), ch.4.
80. Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper?*, p.295.
81. *Daily Film Renter*, 23 Dec. 1954; *Daily Mail*, 22 Dec. 1954; *News Chronicle*, 4 July 1955; *The Daily Herald*, 5 Aug. 1955; Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper?*, pp.288-9, 295.
82. *Sunday Citizen*, 14 Oct. 1962.
83. Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper?*, p.289. Anti-communist movies with which Columbia was involved included *Walk a Crooked Mile* (Gordon Douglas, 1948), *Invasion USA* (Alfred E. Green, 1952) and aforementioned *Walk East on Beacon* (Alfred Werker, 1952).
84. Stein's letter to Rathvon, 31 Jan. 1955, Box 4, folder 11, ACCF archives, Tamiment Library, New York University; Stein's correspondence with author, 28 April 1998.
85. The ending of the film released in the United States corresponded with Orwell's book, with Winston and Julia estranged and the two of them having learned to love Big Brother. Owing to the lack of production records it is not entirely clear why two endings with different messages were made. For a (positive) review of the American

- version see *The New York Times*, 1 Oct. 1956. For the decisions on the two endings see *The Times*, 10 March 1957, p.7.
86. *Sunday Citizen*, 14 Oct. 1962.
 87. *The Daily Herald*, 2 March 1956; *Daily Mail*, 1 March 1956; *Sunday Express*, 4 March 1956; *Daily Mail*, 27 Feb. 1956.
 88. Motion Picture Association of America spokesman, cited in Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation*, p.445. Neither 1984 nor *Animal Farm* were listed during 1955–57 by *Variety*, which computes the box-office sales of all films that gross above \$1 million.
 89. Ironically, Redgrave was on Orwell's list of suspected crypto-communists and fellow-travellers given to the IRD in 1949. See Davison (ed.), *Our Job is to Make Life Worth Living 1949–1950*, p.254.
 90. *Sight and Sound* 53/2 (1984); *New Statesman and Nation*, 10 March 1956.
 91. *Daily Mail*, 27 Feb. 1956; *The Times*, 15 Nov. 1983. The second cinematic adaptation of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* appeared in 1984. Also titled 1984, this was a British film directed by Michael Radford, produced by Virgin, and starring John Hurt (as Winston) and Richard Burton (as O'Brien). For more details of this film, which largely stayed faithful to the book, see in Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation*, pp.285–7.
 92. Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation*, pp.202–4; FBI file: C.F. Downing to Mr. Parsons, 31 March 1959, 'Smear Campaign: Committee for a Return to the Homeland – Internal Security – Russia', <http://foia.fbi.gov/orwell/orwell1.pdf>. During the later stages of the Cold War domestic critics of the US government also saw *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as an analysis of 'Orwellian' aspects of the American social and political system, including the FBI, the CIA and advertising agencies, whose uses of language were often compared to newspeak. See Richard A. Schwartz, *Cold War Culture: Media and the Arts, 1945–1990* (New York: Checkmark Books, 2000), p.230.
 93. PRO FO371/56912/N1221G/10772/38, Minutes by Pierson Dixon, 22 Aug. and 18 Sept. 1946; FO371/56912/N1221G/10772/38, Christopher Warner to Robert Bruce Lockhart, 2 Sept. 1946; FO1110/221/PR505/G, Ralph Murray to Christopher Warner, 28 Jan. 1949; Richard J. Aldrich, *The Hidden Hand: Britain, America and Cold War Secret Intelligence* (London: John Murray, 2001), pp.106–7, 139. A good example of the politico-scholarly veneration of Solzhenitsyn's work in the West during the Cold War is John Dunlop, Richard Haugh and Alexis Klimoff (eds.), *Alexander Solzhenitsyn: Critical Essays and Documentary Materials* (New York: Collier Books, 1975). On Solzhenitsyn's acknowledgement of the importance of Orwell in heightening awareness of the dangers of communism in the West see Joseph Pearce, *Solzhenitsyn: A Soul in Exile* (London: HarperCollins, 1989), p.106.
 94. Rodden, *The Politics of Literary Reputation*, p.16; Timothy Garton Ash in Davison (ed.), *Orwell and Politics*, p.xi.
 95. For further information on this film see: <http://alt.tnt.tv/movies/tntoriginals/animalfarm/atf/info.html>. For a critical reaction to it see: www.wsws.org/articles/1999/nov1999/anim-n12.shtml.

Copyright of Cold War History is the property of Frank Cass & Company Ltd. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.